

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 9 July 2007. Responsive to the Office Action, Claim 7 has been amended, and Claims 1-6, and 11 have been canceled by this Amendment and Claims 12-15 were previously canceled. Upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 7-10 will be pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 7-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Burrell, et al. reference (U.S. Patent #5,454,886, hereinafter "Burrell"). However, the Examiner kindly indicated that Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten in Independent form including all of the limitations of the base Claim and any intervening Claims.

Accordingly, Independent Claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of Claim 11 therein. Therefore, Claim 11 has effectively been rewritten in Independent form to include all of the limitations of the base Claim, Claim 7. Claim 7, however, has not been amended to incorporate the limitations of the intervening Claims, Claims 8-10.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of the limitations of Claims 7 and 11 are neither disclosed nor suggested by Burrell. Burrell nowhere discloses or suggests the sputtering for the first metal target being conducted at a voltage ranging from 20-50V, and a current ranging from 3.5-4.5A; and, the sputtering for the second metal target being

MR3701-50
Application Serial No.10/797,818
Responsive to Office Action dated 09 July 2007

conducted at a voltage of less than 20V, and a current ranging from 0.3-0.5A, the sputtering being conducted at a temperature ranging from 80-180°, at a pressure ranging from 0.1-20 mTorr for a sputtering time ranging from 3-13 minutes, as now defined in Claim 7.

Thus, as Burrell fails to disclose or suggest each and every one of the limitations of Claim 7, as now amended, it cannot make obvious that invention. It is believed that the dependent claims add further patentably distinct limitations, but are at least patentably distinct for the same reasons as Independent Claim 7, upon which they are dependent, and therefore should also be allowable.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
FOR: ROSENBERG KLEIN & LEE



David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 26 Oct. 2007

3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586